UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/450,941	11/29/1999	JACCO BROK	2493-13	8363

23117   7590   04/05/2004

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/450,941	BROK ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 January 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment B filed 1/16/04.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, and 20 are independent

claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumer

have been withdrawn as necessitated by the applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spellman et

al., USPN 6,667,747 filed (5/7/1997) in view of Kubota, USPN 6,041,323 (4/17/1997).

In reference to independent claim 1, 3, Spellman teaches:

A first application program help file is provided with a hyperlink having has associated

therewith a number of parameters including a name of an appropriate remote access macro (as

compared to "*retrieving at least one document from the database in response to a request for*

that document by an electronic document browser"). See column 3, lines 1-9.

Also included with the hyperlink may be a number of ID codes or parameters that

identify the location of a desired help file and a desired portion or section within the desired help

file (as compared to *"scanning the retrieved document to identify said links"*). See column 3,

lines 5-10.

The remote access macro then opens an appropriate second application program that is

capable of reading the desired help file. The second application program uses the parameters to

identify and open the appropriate help file or files and display the desired portion (as compared

to "transforming the links into a format which is recognizable by the document browser and

transmitting the retrieved document including said transformed links to the browser"). See

column 3, lines 10-20.

The reference does not explicitly disclose a set of documents stored electronically "as a

single file". However, Kubota teaches an information search method that utilizes a database. The

database may store individual documents as separate files, or may sequentially arrange all

documents in a consecutive single file. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, having the teachings of Spellman and Kubota before him at the time the invention was made,

to modify the database techniques taught by Spellman to include the consecutive single file

methods of Kubota, because it would have given the user a high speed search for a document.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Spellman teaches:

The help engine of the second application program uses the parameters (ID Codes) to

identify and open the appropriate help resource file and display the desired portion or section

indicated by the parameters in a second window. See column 6, lines 35-45.

In reference to independent claim 4, Spellman teaches:

A first application program help file is provided with a hyperlink having has associated

therewith a number of parameters including a name of an appropriate remote access macro (as

compared to *"retrieving at least one document from the database in response to a request for*

that document by an electronic document browser"). See column 3, lines 1-9.

Also included with the hyperlink may be a number of ID codes or parameters that

identify the location of a desired help file and a desired portion or section within the desired help

file (as compared to *"scanning the retrieved document to identify said links"*). See column 3,

lines 5-10.

The remote access macro then opens an appropriate second application program that is

capable of reading the desired help file. The second application program uses the parameters to

identify and open the appropriate help file or files and display the desired portion (as compared

to "transforming the links into a format which is recognizable by the document browser and

transmitting the retrieved document including said transformed links to the browser"). See

column 3, lines 10-20.

The reference does not explicitly disclose a set of documents stored electronically "as a

single file". However, Kubota teaches an information search method that utilizes a database. The

database may store individual documents as separate files, or may sequentially arrange all

documents in a consecutive single file. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, having the teachings of Spellman and Kubota before him at the time the invention was made,

to modify the database techniques taught by Spellman to include the consecutive single file

methods of Kubota, because it would have given the user a high speed search for a document.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Spellman teaches:

An advantage of having a help database located at a remote site, such as an internet site,

is that potentially more help information can be provided and maintained than is economically

feasible if distributed with the software and transferring information within separate windows, but the same browser and therefore one unit. See column 8, lines 43-45. The reference provides a reasonable suggestion of utilizing a separate database for retrieving help files.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Spellman teaches:

The interface may be a LAN, or other type of network including an Internet or intranet network. See column 8, lines 7-10.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Spellman teaches:

The Internet browser program uses the Internet address to locate a remote server at an Internet site. The ID codes may also identify the desired help resource file and the desired tag therein. See column 8, lines 25-28.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Spellman teaches:

The Internet browser program uses the Internet address to locate a remote server at an Internet site. The ID codes may also identify the desired help resource file and the desired tag therein. See column 8, lines 25-28.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Spellman teaches:

By accessing the Dyna-Text browser program, a hyperlink can access help resource files and other information that is not compiled or otherwise compatible with the Microsoft Windows help engine, and in particular files that are compiled into a particular SGML format. See column 7, lines 28-35. The reference does not explicitly disclose an HTML document; however, the SGML format disclosed in Spellman provides a user with a similar type of document that may be retrieved from a compatible application.

In reference to dependent claim10, Spellman teaches:

An advantage of having a help database located at a remote site, such as an internet site, is that potentially more help information can be provided and maintained than is economically feasible if distributed with the software. For example, the entire user manual may be provided on-line at the software developers Internet site. See column 8, lines 42-49.

In reference to dependent claim 11, Spellman teaches:

Selected parameters provided by the hyperlink are passed to the UNILAB macro, including the document and topic fields. These parameters identify a desired help resource file. See column 11, lines 19-52.

In reference to claims 12-20, the claims reflect the system comprising an arrangement used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1-11, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Knauerhase et al.,   USPN 6,345,303   filed (10/6/97)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
March 16, 2004

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER